arXiv:1404.1768v4 [math.NA] 9 Jun 2015

A FEAST ALGORITHM WITH OBLIQUE PROJECTION FOR GENERALIZED EIGENVALUE PROBLEMS

GUOJIAN YIN*, RAYMOND H. CHAN†, AND MAN-CHUNG YEUNG‡

Abstract. The contour-integral based eigensolvers are the recent efforts for computing the eigenvalues inside a given region in the complex plane. The best-known members are the Sakurai-Sugiura (SS) method, its stable version CIRR, and the FEAST algorithm. An attractive computational advantage of these methods is that they are easily parallelizable. The FEAST algorithm was developed for the generalized Hermitian eigenvalue problems. It is stable and accurate. However, it may fail when applied to non-Hermitian problems. In this paper, we extend the FEAST algorithm to non-Hermitian problems. The approach can be summarized as follows: (i) to construct a particular contour integral to form a subspace containing the desired eigenspace, and (ii) to use the oblique projection technique to extract desired eigenpairs with appropriately chosen test subspace. The related mathematical framework is established. We also address some implementation issues such as how to choose a suitable starting matrix and design good stopping criteria. Numerical experiments are provided to illustrate that our method is stable and efficient.

Key words. generalized eigenvalue problems, contour integral, spectral projection

AMS subject classifications. 15A18, 58C40, 65F15

1. Introduction.

Consider the generalized eigenvalue problem

$$A\mathbf{x} = \lambda B\mathbf{x}, \tag{1.1}$$

where $A, B \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$. The scalars $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and the associated vectors $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^n, \mathbf{x} \neq 0$, are called the eigenvalues and eigenvectors, respectively. In this paper, we are concerned with computing the eigenvalues of (1.1) that are located inside a given region in the complex plane together with their eigenvectors.

Large-scale generalized eigenvalue problems arise in various areas of science and engineering, such as dynamic analysis of structures [18], determination of the linearized stability of 3-D fluid flows [7], the electron energy and position problems in quantum chemistry [13], the widely used principal component analysis [36], and the linear discriminant analysis in statistical data analysis [10]. In some applications, it is not the whole spectrum but rather a significant part of it is of interest to the users. For example, in the electronic structure calculations of materials [30], it is required to compute the lowest portion of the spectrum of (1.1); and in the model reduction of a linear dynamical system, one only needs to know the response over a range of frequencies, see [4, 15].

Solving (1.1) is a very challenging problem, even if there are various practical methods and software available, see [4]. When A and B have no special structures and the whole spectrum is required, the QZ method [25] is the most widely used method. It uses a sequence of unitary equivalence transformations to reduce the original pair (A, B) to generalized Schur form. The algorithm is numerically stable. However its computational cost is expensive, requiring about $46n^3$ floating point operations [17].

*Department of Mathematics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, Hong Kong (guojianyin@gmail.com).

†Department of Mathematics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, Hong Kong. Research is supported in part by HKRGC GRF Grant No. CUHK400412, HKRGC CRF Grant No. CUHK2/CRF/11G, HKRGC AoE Grant AoE/M-05/12, CUHK DAG No. 4053007, and CUHK FIS Grant No. 1902036 (rchan@math.cuhk.edu.hk).

‡Department of Mathematics, University of Wyoming, Dept. 3036, 1000 East University Avenue, Laramie, WY 82071, USA (myeung@uwyo.edu).

There are several methods for computing only part of the spectrum of (1.1). The rational Krylov subspace method approximates all eigenvalues in a union of regions around the chosen shifts [28]. However, it needs locking, purging and implicit restart techniques, which create difficulties in practical implementation. The divide-and-conquer approaches, which are based on the sign-function or inverse-free techniques, are also popular choices [5]. However, these approaches always suffer from slow convergence or poor stability [26]. When A and B are Hermitian, a shifted block Lanczos algorithm was proposed in [18] to compute the eigenvalues contained in a given interval. The authors designed a shift strategy combining with the LDL decomposition to guarantee that all eigenvalues in the given interval can be found. But the shift strategy is complicated in practical implementation and its efficiency depends on the distribution of the spectrum.

The methods based on contour integral are recent efforts for solving partial spectrum of (1.1). When (1.1) is a diagonalizable and non-degenerate system, a contour integral method, called the Sakurai-Sugiura (SS) method, was proposed in [32] for evaluating the eigenvalues inside a specific domain. In this method, the original problem (1.1) is reduced to a small eigenproblem with Hankel matrices. However, since Hankel matrices are usually ill-conditioned [6], the SS method always suffers from numerical instability [3, 33]. Later in [33], Sakurai *et al.* used the Rayleigh-Ritz procedure to replace the Hankel matrix approach to get a more stable algorithm called CIRR. In [21] and [20] the block versions of SS and CIRR were proposed respectively to make SS and CIRR also available for degenerate systems. It was shown that SS and CIRR, as well as their corresponding block variants, can be regarded as the Krylov subspace techniques [19, 21].

Recently in [27], Polizzi proposed another eigenproblem solver based on contour integral, called FEAST, to solve (1.1) under the assumptions that A and B are Hermitian and B is positive definite, i.e, (1.1) is a Hermitian system or $zB - A$ is a definite matrix pencil [4]. His algorithm computes all eigenvalues inside a given interval, along with their associated eigenvectors. The FEAST algorithm is accurate and reliable, see [23] for more details. It was shown that the FEAST algorithm can be understood as a standard subspace iteration with the Rayleigh-Ritz procedure [38].

The FEAST algorithm originally was proposed for Hermitian problems. However, when it is applied to non-Hermitian problems, it may fail to find the desired eigenvalues. A simple example (Example 3.1) will be given later to illustrate this. Motivated by this fact, our goal is to generalize the FEAST algorithm to non-Hermitian problems and establish the related mathematical framework. The only requirement in our method is that the corresponding matrix pencil $zB - A$ is regular, i.e., $\det(zB - A)$ is not identically zero for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$. In other words, our new method can deal with the most common generalized eigenvalue problems [4]. Unlike FEAST which uses the Rayleigh-Ritz procedure to extract the desired eigenpairs, our generalized FEAST algorithm uses the oblique projection technique to find them.

One of the main drawbacks of the contour-integral based algorithms, including ours, is that the information about the number of desired eigenvalues has to be known a priori. This is because we need this information (i) to choose an appropriate size for the starting matrix to start the methods, and (ii) to determine whether all desired eigenvalues are captured when the methods stop. In this paper, we use a way similar to that proposed in [31] to find an upper bound of the number of eigenvalues inside the target region. It will help to choose the starting matrix. We also provide good stopping criteria which not only can guarantee that all desired eigenpairs are captured,

but also can give the accuracy that our method can achieve. With these efforts, our method is applicable in practical implementation. Comparisons with MATLAB's `eig` command and the block version of CIRR [20, 31] show that our method is an efficient and stable solver for large generalized eigenvalue problems.

The outline of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we briefly describe two typical contour-integral based eigensolvers: the CIRR method [33] and the FEAST algorithm [27]. In Section 3, we extend the FEAST algorithm to non-Hermitian problems and establish the related mathematical framework. In Section 4, we present a way to find a suitable upper bound of the number of eigenvalues inside the prescribed region and give the stopping criteria. Then we present the complete algorithm of our method. In Section 5, numerical experiments are reported to illustrate the efficiency and stability of our method.

Throughout the paper, we use the following notation and terminology. The subspace spanned by the columns of a matrix X is denoted by $\mathrm{span}\{X\}$. The rank and conjugate transpose of X are denoted by $\mathrm{rank}(X)$ and X^* respectively. We denote the submatrix consisting of the first i rows and the first j columns of X by $X_{(1:i,1:j)}$, the submatrixs consisting of the first j columns of X and the first i rows of X by $X_{(:,1:j)}$ and $X_{(1:i,:)}$ respectively. The algorithms are presented in MATLAB style.

2. Two typical contour-integral based eigensolvers. In this section, we briefly introduce two typical contour-integral based eigensolvers: the CIRR method and the FEAST algorithm. Before starting our discussion, we present some facts about matrix pencil which will play important roles in the derivation of these methods.

Recall that the matrix pencil $(zB-A)$ is regular if $\det(zB-A)$ is not identically zero for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$. The Weierstrass canonical form for regular matrix pencils is given below.

THEOREM 2.1 ([16]). *Let $zB-A$ be a regular matrix pencil of order n. Then there exist nonsingular matrices S and $T \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ such that*

$$TAS = \begin{bmatrix} J_d & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n-d} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad TBS = \begin{bmatrix} I_d & 0 \\ 0 & N_{n-d} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{2.1}$$

where J_d is a $d \times d$ matrix in Jordan canonical form with its diagonal entries corresponding to the eigenvalues of $zB-A$, N_{n-d} is an $(n-d)\times(n-d)$ nilpotent matrix also in Jordan canonical form, and I_d denotes the identity matrix of order d.

Let J_d be of the form

$$J_d = \begin{bmatrix} J_{d_1}(\lambda_1) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & J_{d_2}(\lambda_2) & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & J_{d_m}(\lambda_m) \end{bmatrix} \tag{2.2}$$

where $\sum_{i=1}^{m} d_i = d$ and $J_{d_i}(\lambda_i)$ are $d_i \times d_i$ matrices of the form

$$J_{d_i}(\lambda_i) = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_i & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_i & 1 & & \vdots \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & 1 \\ 0 & \cdots & & 0 & \lambda_i \end{bmatrix}, \qquad i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$$

with λ_i being the eigenvalues. Here the λ_i are not necessarily distinct and can be repeated according to their multiplicities.

Let $N_{(n-d)}$ be of the form

$$N_{(n-d)} = \begin{bmatrix} N_{d'_1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & N_{d'_2} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & N_{d'_{m'}} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\sum_{i=1}^{m'} d'_i = n - d$ and $N_{d'_i}$ are $d'_i \times d'_i$ matrices of the form

$$N_{d'_i} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & & \vdots \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & 1 \\ 0 & \cdots & & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \qquad i = 1, 2, \ldots, m'.$$

Let us partition S into block form

$$S = [S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_m, S_{m+1}], \tag{2.3}$$

where $S_i \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times d_i}$, $1 \le i \le m$ and $S_{m+1} \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times (n-d)}$. One can easily verify by (2.1) (or see (3.8)) that the first column in each S_i, $i = 1, \ldots, m$, is the eigenvector associated with the eigenvalue λ_i of (1.1).

2.1. The CIRR method. In [32], Sakurai *et al.* used a moment-based technique to formulate a contour-integral based method, which now is known as SS, for finding the eigenvalues of (1.1) inside a given region. Since the SS method suffers from numerical instability, a stable version, called the CIRR method, was later developed using the Rayleigh-Ritz procedure [20, 33].

Below we show how to use the CIRR method to compute the eigenvalues inside Γ, which is a given positively oriented simple closed curve in the complex plane. Without loss of generality, let the set of eigenvalues of (1.1) enclosed by Γ be $\{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_l\}$, and $s := d_1 + d_2 + \cdots + d_l$ be the number of eigenvalues inside Γ with multiplicity taken into account. Define the contour integrals

$$F_i := \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{-1}} \oint_\Gamma z^i (zB - A)^{-1} dz, \quad i = 0, 1, \ldots. \tag{2.4}$$

It was shown in [20] that

$$F_i = S_{(:,1:s)} (J_{(1:s,1:s)})^i T_{(1:s,:)} \tag{2.5}$$

where S and T are given by Theorem 2.1. The CIRR method uses the Rayleigh-Ritz procedure to extract the eigenpairs inside Γ [33]. Originally, it was derived under the assumptions that (1.1) is a Hermitian system and the desired eigenvalues are distinct, i.e., they are non-degenerate [33]. However, based on the following theorem, the CIRR method was extended to non-Hermitian cases in [20].

THEOREM 2.2 ([20]). *Let L, $D \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times t}$, $t \ge s$, be arbitrary matrices, and $R = F_0 D$, where F_0 is defined in (2.4). A projected matrix pencil $z\hat{B} - \hat{A}$ is defined*

by $\hat{B} = L^*BR$ *and* $\hat{A} = L^*AR$. *If the ranks of both* $L^*(T^{-1})_{(:,1:s)}$ *and* $T_{(1:s,:)}D$ *are* s, *the non-singular part of the projected matrix pencil is equivalent to* $zI_s - (J_d)_{(1:s,1:s)}$.

Theorem 2.2 says that the desired eigenvalues $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^s$ can be solved by computing the eigenvalues of the projected eigenproblem $z\hat{B} - \hat{A}$, if the ranks of both $L^*(T^{-1})_{(:,1:s)}$ and $T_{(1:s,:)}D$ are s.

Define the columns of D to be

$$D_{(:,i)} = (T^{-1})_{(:,1:s)}(J_{(1:s,1:s)})^{i-1}T_{(1:s,:)}v, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, t. \tag{2.6}$$

It is shown in [21] that the rank of $T_{(1:s,:)}D$ is s, if all the elements of $T_{(1:s,:)}v$ are non-zero and there is no degeneracy in $J_{(1:s,1:s)}$. By (2.4) and (2.6), we have

$$R_{(:,i)} = F_0 D_{(:,i)} = F_i v, \quad i = 1, \ldots, t. \tag{2.7}$$

Based on Theorem 2.2, the right Ritz space is spanned by the vectors $\{F_i v\}_{i=0}^{t-1}$. As for the left Ritz space, in the CIRR for non-Hermitian problems, it is chosen to be the same as the right one.

In order to remove the restriction on the non-degeneracy in $J_{(1:s,1:s)}$, a block CIRR method was also proposed in [20], where the random vector v is replaced by a random matrix $Y \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times h}$ of appropriate dimension. The right and the left Ritz spaces are spanned by the vectors $\{F_i Y\}_{i=0}^{g-1}$, where g is a positive integer satisfying $hg \geq s$. Then all eigenvalues of h'-order degeneracy, $h' \leq h$, can be found [20, 31]. Obviously, the main task of the block CIRR method is to evaluate $\{F_i Y\}_{i=0}^{g-1}$. In practice, $F_i Y$ are computed approximately by a quadrature scheme according to (2.4). Below is the block CIRR algorithm for non-Hermitian problems.

ALGORITHM 1. *Input matrices* A *and* B, *a random matrix* $Y \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times h}$, *and a positive integer* g *satisfying* $t = hg \geq s$. *The function "*BLOCK_CIRR*" computes eigenpairs of (1.1) that are located inside* Γ, *and they are output in the vector* Λ_s *and the matrix* X_s.

Function $[\Lambda_s, X_s] =$ BLOCK_CIRR(A, B, Y, g, Γ)

1. Compute $R_i = F_i Y, i = 0, 1, \ldots, g-1$, approximately by a quadrature scheme.
2. Compute the singular value decomposition: $[R_0, \ldots, R_{h-1}] = U\Sigma V^*$.
3. Set $\bar{A} = U^*AU$ and $\bar{B} = U^*BU$.
4. Solve the generalized eigenproblem of size t: $\bar{A}\mathbf{y} = \bar{\lambda}\bar{B}\mathbf{y}$, to obtain the eigenpairs $\{(\bar{\lambda}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)\}_{i=1}^t$.
5. Compute $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i = U\mathbf{y}_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots t$, and select s approximate eigenpairs.

We see that for Algorithm 1, in order to choose the parameters h and g, one needs to know s and the degrees of degeneracy of the desired eigenvalues. In the recent article [31], Sakurai *et al.* gave a method to choose a suitable h for fixed g. We will describe the method in Section 4.1. Also in [31], the authors suggested to perform iterative refinement in case the eigenpairs computed by Algorithm 1 cannot attain the prescribed accuracy.

2.2. The FEAST algorithm. In this section, we give a brief introduction to the FEAST algorithm [27] due to Polizzi. The FEAST algorithm was formulated under the assumptions A and B are Hermitian and B is positive definite, in which case the eigenvalues of (1.1) are real-valued [4]. It is used to find all eigenvalues of (1.1) within a specified interval, say $[\sigma_1, \sigma_2]$, and their associated eigenvectors. Here we also assume that the desired eigenvalues are $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \ldots \leq \lambda_s$. Let Γ be any

contour that contains $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^s$ inside. For example, Γ can be the circle with center at $c = (\sigma_1 + \sigma_2)/2$ and radius $r = (\sigma_2 - \sigma_1)/2$.

When $zB - A$ is a definite matrix pencil, the Weierstrass canonical form (2.1) is reduced to

$$TAS = \Lambda = \text{diag}([\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \cdots, \lambda_n]) \quad \text{and} \quad TBS = I_n. \tag{2.8}$$

It is easy to see that $T = S^*$, and the columns $S_{(:,i)}$ are the eigenvectors corresponding to λ_i, $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Therefore according to (2.5), we have

$$F_0 = S_{(:,1:s)}T_{(1:s,:)} = S_{(:,1:s)}(S_{(:,1:s)})^*. \tag{2.9}$$

Let $W := F_0Y = S_{(:,1:s)}(S_{(:,1:s)})^*Y$, where Y is an $n \times t$ matrix with $t \geq s$. Then W forms a basis for the desired eigenspace $\text{span}\{S_{(:,1:s)}\}$ if $(S_{(:,1:s)})^*Y$ is full-rank. In the FEAST algorithm, the elements of Y are chosen to be random numbers to increase the chance that W may form a basis for $\text{span}\{S_{(:,1:s)}\}$. According to the Rayleigh-Ritz procedure [27, 37], the problem (1.1) is transformed to the problem of computing the eigenpairs of the smaller generalized eigenvalue problem

$$\hat{A}\mathbf{y} = \lambda\hat{B}\mathbf{y}$$

of size $t \times t$, where $\hat{A} = W^*AW$, $\hat{B} = W^*BW$, and $t < n$.

Now the task is to get the basis $W = F_0Y$. Since $S_{(:,1:s)}$ is unknown, one cannot use (2.9). Instead W is computed by (2.4) numerically using a quadrature scheme such as the Gauss-Legendre quadrature rule [11]. The complete FEAST algorithm is given as follows.

ALGORITHM 2. *Input Hermitian matrices A and B with B being positive definite, a random matrix $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times t}$, where $t \geq s$, the circle Γ enclosing the interval $[\sigma_1, \sigma_2]$, and a convergence tolerance ϵ. The function "*FEAST*" computes eigenpairs $(\hat{\lambda}_i, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i)$ of (1.1) that satisfy*

$$\hat{\lambda}_i \in [\sigma_1, \sigma_2] \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{s} \hat{\lambda}_i < \epsilon, \tag{2.10}$$

and they are output in the vector Λ_s and the matrix X_s.

Function $[\Lambda_s, X_s] = \text{FEAST}(A, B, Y, \Gamma, \epsilon)$

1. Compute $W = F_0Y$ approximately by the Gauss-Legendre quadrature rule.
2. Set $\hat{A} = W^*AW$ and $\hat{B} = W^*BW$.
3. Solve the generalized eigenproblem of size t: $\hat{A}\mathbf{y} = \hat{\lambda}\hat{B}\mathbf{y}$, to obtain the eigenpairs $\{(\hat{\lambda}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)\}_{i=1}^t$.
4. Compute $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_i = W\mathbf{y}_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots t$.
5. Check if $\{(\hat{\lambda}_i, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_i)\}_{i=1}^t$ satisfy the convergence criteria (2.10). If s eigenpairs satisfy (2.10), stop. Otherwise, set $X_t = [\hat{\mathbf{x}}_1, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_2, \ldots, \hat{\mathbf{x}}_t]$ and $Y = BX_t$, then go back to Step 1.

The FEAST algorithm can be understood as a standard subspace iteration combining with the Rayleigh-Ritz procedure [38]. It is an accurate and reliable technique [23]. However, like CIRR, in practice we have to know s in advance in order to choose t for the starting matrix Y and to determine whether all desired eigenpairs are found. In [38], a technique was presented to find an estimation of s under the conditions that A and B are Hermitian and B is positive definite. The estimation can help to select an appropriate starting matrix Y.

3. A FEAST method with oblique projection. The FEAST method was originally developed for generalized Hermitian eigenvalue problems. We note that it may fail when applied to non-Hermitian problems, as is shown by the following example.

EXAMPLE 3.1: Let A and B be defined as follows:

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 5 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.5 & 0 & 0 \\ 0.2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then (2.1) holds with

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In fact, $TAS = \text{diag}([5, 2, 0.5, 0.2])$ and $TBS = I_4$. Suppose we want to find the eigenvalues of $A\mathbf{x} = \lambda B\mathbf{x}$ lying inside the unit circle. Obviously, the eigenvalues of interest are 0.2 and 0.5, and the corresponding eigenvectors are $S_{(:,4)} = [1, 0, 0, 0]^*$ and $S_{(:,3)} = [0, 1, 0, 0]^*$. By (2.5) and (2.9), it is easy to check that all projected matrices $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$ in the FEAST algorithm are zero for any given random matrix Y. Hence any complex number will be an eigenvalue of the corresponding projected eigenproblem $\hat{A}\mathbf{y} = \lambda\hat{B}\mathbf{y}$!

In view of the above example, we now extend the FEAST algorithm to non-Hermitian problems. The only requirement of our method is that the corresponding matrix pencil $zB - A$ is regular. Hence our method can deal with the most common generalized eigenvalue problems [4]. Below we establish the related mathematical framework.

Again without loss of generality, we let the eigenvalues of (1.1) enclosed by Γ be $\{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_l\}$, and $s := d_1 + d_2 + \cdots + d_l$ be the number of eigenvalues inside Γ with multiplicity taken into account. Define the contour integral

$$Q := F_0 = \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{-1}} \oint_\Gamma (zB - A)^{-1} B dz. \tag{3.1}$$

For $z \neq \lambda_i$, according to (2.2) the matrix $zI_d - J_d$ is invertible. Hence by (2.1), the resolvent operator is given by

$$\begin{aligned} (zB - A)^{-1}B &= S \begin{bmatrix} (zI_d - J_d)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & (zN_{n-d} - I_{n-d})^{-1} \end{bmatrix} TB \\ &= S \begin{bmatrix} (zI_d - J_d)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & (zN_{n-d} - I_{n-d})^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} I_d & 0 \\ 0 & N_{n-d} \end{bmatrix} S^{-1} \\ &= S \begin{bmatrix} (zI_d - J_d)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & (zN_{n-d} - I_{n-d})^{-1} N_{n-d} \end{bmatrix} S^{-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Notice that the first diagonal block $(zI_d - J_d)^{-1}$ in (3.2) is of the block diagonal form

where each diagonal sub-block is of the form:

$$(zI_{d_i} - J_{d_i}(\lambda_i))^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{z-\lambda_i} & \frac{1}{(z-\lambda_i)^2} & \cdots & \frac{1}{(z-\lambda_i)^{d_i}} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{z-\lambda_i} & \cdots & \frac{1}{(z-\lambda_i)^{d_i-1}} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \frac{1}{z-\lambda_i} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{3.3}$$

Similarly, the second diagonal block in (3.2) is also of the block diagonal form where each diagonal sub-block is of the form:

$$(zN_{d_i'} - I_{d_i'})^{-1} N_{d_i'} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 & -z & \cdots & -z^{d_i'-2} \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & \cdots & -z^{d_i'-3} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & -z^{d_i'-4} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{3.4}$$

Then, according to the residue theorem in complex analysis [1], it follows from (3.2)–(3.4) that

$$Q = \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{-1}} \oint_\Gamma (zB - A)^{-1} B dz = S \begin{bmatrix} I_s & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} S^{-1} = S_{(:,1:s)} (S^{-1})_{(1:s,:)}. \tag{3.5}$$

Using the remark following (2.3), we know that $\mathcal{K} := \text{span}\{S_{(:,1:s)}\}$ contains the eigenspace corresponding to the eigenvalues $\{\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_l\}$. Since $Q^2 = Q$, Q is a spectral projector onto $\mathcal{K}$. Define $U := QY$, where Y is an appropriately chosen matrix so that U forms a basis for $\mathcal{K}$. As in FEAST, we choose Y randomly, and we show below that the resulting U does form a basis for $\mathcal{K}$.

LEMMA 3.1. *Let $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times s}$. If the entries of Y are random numbers from a continuous distribution and that they are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.), then with probability 1, the matrix $(S^{-1})_{(1:s,:)}Y$ is nonsingular.*

Proof. Let $Z = (S^{-1})_{(1:s,:)}Y$. Consider $|\det(Z)|^2$, the square of the absolute value of $\det(Z)$, as a real coefficient polynomial in the elements of Y. We now show that the polynomial is non-zero, i.e. $|\det(Z)|^2 \not\equiv 0$.

Since the rank of $(S^{-1})_{(1:s,:)}$ is s, it has an $s \times s$ nonsingular submatrix. Without loss of generality, let the left $s \times s$ submatrix of $(S^{-1})_{(1:s,:)}$ be nonsingular. Then set $Y = [I_s, 0]^T$, we have $\det(Z) = \det((S^{-1})_{(1:s,:)}Y) \neq 0$. Therefore the polynomial $|\det(Z)|^2$ is not identically zero. Hence the set $\mathcal{Z}$ of zeros of the polynomial $|\det(Z)|^2$ is of measure zero in $\mathbb{R}^{ns}$ according to [22, Prop. 4]. When Y is randomly picked, it is with probability 1 that $Y \notin \mathcal{Z}$, or equivalently, $|\det((S^{-1})_{(1:s,:)}Y)|^2 \neq 0$. ∎

Since

$$U = QY = S_{(:,1:s)}(S^{-1})_{(1:s,:)}Y, \tag{3.6}$$

and $(S^{-1})_{(1:s,:)}Y$ is nonsingular by Lemma 3.1, the columns of U form a basis for $\mathcal{K}$. Our next step is to project the original problem (1.1) onto a small subspace where we can extract the required eigenpairs. Unlike CIRR and FEAST which use the Rayleigh-Ritz procedure to extract the desired eigenpairs, here we resort to the oblique

projection method, namely, the Petrov-Galerkin condition [4, 29]. Since $\mathcal{K}$ contains the eigenspace corresponding to the eigenvalues inside Γ, it is natural to choose $\mathcal{K}$ as the search subspace. Our next task is to seek an appropriate test subspace.

Let us further partition each S_i in (2.3) into $S_i = [\mathbf{s}_1^i, \mathbf{s}_2^i, \ldots, \mathbf{s}_{d_i}^i]$ with $\mathbf{s}_j^i \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $1 \le i \le m, 1 \le j \le d_i$. Notice that by (2.1), we have for any eigenvalue λ_i, $1 \le i \le m$,

$$\begin{aligned}(\lambda_i B - A)S \begin{bmatrix} I_d & 0 \\ 0 & N_{n-d} \end{bmatrix} &= T^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_i I_d - J_d & 0 \\ 0 & (\lambda_i N_{n-d} - I_{n-d}) N_{n-d} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= T^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} I_d & 0 \\ 0 & N_{n-d} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_i I_d - J_d & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_i N_{n-d} - I_{n-d} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= BS \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_i I_d - J_d & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_i N_{n-d} - I_{n-d} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

By comparing the first d columns on both sides above, we get

$$(\lambda_i B - A)\mathbf{s}_j^i = B\mathbf{s}_{j-1}^i, \quad 1 \le j \le d_i, \quad 1 \le i \le m, \tag{3.8}$$

with $\mathbf{s}_0^i \equiv \mathbf{0}$. In particular, $\mathbf{s}_1^i$ is the eigenvector corresponding to the eigenvalue λ_i for all $1 \le i \le m$. From (3.8), we see that $A\mathcal{K} \subseteq B\mathcal{K}$. Therefore we choose $B\mathcal{K}$ as the test subspace. The Petrov-Galerkin condition then becomes:

$$(A\mathbf{x}_i - \lambda_i B\mathbf{x}_i) \perp B\mathcal{K}, \quad 1 \le i \le l, \tag{3.9}$$

with $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{K}$.

Now we are in the position to find a basis for $B\mathcal{K}$. From (2.1), we know that the rank of $BS_{(:,1:s)}$ is s. Hence by Lemma 3.1, $BU = BS_{(:,1:s)}(S^{-1})_{(1:s,:)}Y$ is full-rank, which implies that BU forms a basis for $B\mathcal{K}$. Recall that U forms a basis for $\mathcal{K}$, and we seek an $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{K}$. Therefore (3.9) can be written in matrix form

$$(BU)^*(AU\mathbf{y}_i - \lambda_i BU\mathbf{y}_i) = 0, \tag{3.10}$$

where $\mathbf{y}_i \in \mathbb{C}^s$ satisfying $\mathbf{x}_i = U\mathbf{y}_i$. Accordingly, we get the projected eigenproblem

$$\tilde{A}\mathbf{y} = \tilde{\lambda}\tilde{B}\mathbf{y}, \tag{3.11}$$

with

$$\tilde{A} = (BU)^* AU \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{B} = (BU)^* BU. \tag{3.12}$$

Our method is to compute the desired eigenpairs of (1.1) by solving the projected eigenproblem (3.11). The theory behind our method is given in the next theorem.

THEOREM 3.2.

(a) Let $\{(\tilde{\lambda}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)\}_{i=1}^s$ be s eigenpairs of the projected eigenproblem (3.11). Then $\{(\tilde{\lambda}_i, U\mathbf{y}_i)\}_{i=1}^s$ are the eigenpairs of (1.1) located inside Γ.

(b) If $\mathcal{Y}_{\tilde{\lambda}_i}$ is the eigenspace of (3.11) corresponding to the eigenvalue $\tilde{\lambda}_i$, then $U\mathcal{Y}_{\tilde{\lambda}_i}$ is the eigenspace of (1.1) corresponding to the eigenvalue $\tilde{\lambda}_i$.

Proof. (a): First, since $A\mathcal{K} \subseteq B\mathcal{K}$ and BU forms a basis for $B\mathcal{K}$, there exist vectors $\mathbf{q}_i \in \mathbb{C}^s, 1 \le i \le s$, such that

$$AU\mathbf{y}_i - \tilde{\lambda}_i BU\mathbf{y}_i = BU\mathbf{q}_i, \quad 1 \le i \le s.$$

By (3.10), we have $(BU)^*(BU)\mathbf{q}_i = 0$. Since BU is full-rank, $\mathbf{q}_i = 0$. Consequently, $AU\mathbf{y}_i = \tilde{\lambda}_i BU\mathbf{y}_i$. Thus $\{(\tilde{\lambda}_i, U\mathbf{y}_i)\}_{i=1}^s$ are the eigenpairs of (1.1).

Next we want to show that $\{\tilde{\lambda}_i\}_{i=1}^s$ are exactly the s eigenvalues of (1.1) inside Γ. By (3.7), we can easily verify that

$$(zB - A)S_{(:,1:s)} = BS_{(:,1:s)}(zI_s - (J_d)_{(1:s,1:s)}), \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Hence by the definitions in (3.12) and (3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} z\tilde{B} - \tilde{A} &= (BU)^*(zB - A)S_{(:,1:s)}(S^{-1})_{(1:s,:)}Y \\ &= (BU)^*BS_{(:,1:s)}(zI_s - (J_d)_{(1:s,1:s)})(S^{-1})_{(1:s,:)}Y. \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Therefore,

$$\det(z\tilde{B} - \tilde{A}) = \det((BU)^*BS_{(:,1:s)})\det(zI_s - (J_d)_{(1:s,1:s)})\det((S^{-1})_{(1:s,:)}Y).$$

Since $BS_{(:,1:s)}$ is of full rank s (see (2.1)), and $(S^{-1})_{(1:s,:)}Y$ is nonsingular by Lemma 3.1, the matrix $(BU)^*BS_{(:,1:s)} = ((S^{-1})_{(1:s,:)}Y)^*(BS_{(:,1:s)})^*BS_{(:,1:s)}$ is nonsingular. Hence $\det(z\tilde{B} - \tilde{A}) = 0$ if and only if $\det(zI_s - (J_d)_{(1:s,1:s)}) = 0$. By the special structure of $(J_d)_{(1:s,1:s)}$ (see (2.2)), the zeros of the determinant $\det(z\tilde{B} - \tilde{A})$ are precisely $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^l$ with multiplicities $\{d_i\}_{i=1}^l$ respectively. Therefore, $\{\tilde{\lambda}_i\}_{i=1}^s$ are precisely all the eigenvalues of (1.1) inside Γ.

(b): Let $\mathcal{X}_{\tilde{\lambda}_i}$ be the eigenspace of (1.1) corresponding to the eigenvalue $\tilde{\lambda}_i$. Then $U\mathcal{Y}_{\tilde{\lambda}_i} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{\tilde{\lambda}_i}$ by Part(a). From (2.2) and (3.13), it can be seen that $\dim(\mathcal{Y}_{\tilde{\lambda}_i})$ is equal to the number of Jordan blocks in $(J_d)_{(1:s,1:s)}$ corresponding to the eigenvalue $\tilde{\lambda}_i$. On the other hand, the later coincides with the number of Jordan blocks in J_d corresponding to $\tilde{\lambda}_i$, which is equal to $\dim(\mathcal{X}_{\tilde{\lambda}_i})$. Therefore, we have $\dim(\mathcal{Y}_{\tilde{\lambda}_i}) = \dim(\mathcal{X}_{\tilde{\lambda}_i})$. Since U has full column rank, it follows that

$$\dim(U\mathcal{Y}_{\tilde{\lambda}_i}) = \dim(\mathcal{Y}_{\tilde{\lambda}_i}) = \dim(\mathcal{X}_{\tilde{\lambda}_i}).$$

Therefore, we have $U\mathcal{Y}_{\tilde{\lambda}_i} = \mathcal{X}_{\tilde{\lambda}_i}$. □

Thus computing the eigenpairs of (1.1) inside Γ is transformed into computing the eigenpairs of the small $s \times s$ projected problem (3.11), which can be solved by standard solvers in LAPACK [4, 12], such as `xGGES` and `xGGEV` [2].

In order to construct the projected eigenproblem (3.11), the most important task is to compute the matrix U in (3.6). In practice, we have to compute U by using the contour integral in (3.5), i.e.

$$U = QY = \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{-1}} \oint_\Gamma (zB - A)^{-1}BdzY, \tag{3.14}$$

which can be approximated by using for example the Gauss-Legendre quadrature rule.

We summarize our above derivation into the following algorithm.

ALGORITHM 3. *Input $A, B \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$, an i.i.d. random matrix $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times t}$ where $t \geq s$, a closed curve Γ, a convergence tolerance ϵ, and "`max_iter`" to control the maximum number of iterations. The function "*EIGENPAIRS*" computes eigenpairs $(\tilde{\lambda}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i)$ of (1.1) that satisfies*

$$\tilde{\lambda}_i \text{ inside } \Gamma \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\|A\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i - \tilde{\lambda}_i B\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i\|_2}{\|A\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i\|_2 + \|B\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i\|_2} < \epsilon. \tag{3.15}$$

The results are stored in the vector Λ and the matrix X.

Function $[\Lambda, X] = \text{EIGENPAIRS}(A, B, Y, \Gamma, \epsilon, \texttt{max_iter})$
1. For $k = 1, \cdots, \texttt{max_iter}$
2. Compute U in (3.14) approximately by the Gauss-Legendre quadrature rule.
3. Compute QR decompositions: $U = U_1 R_1$ and $BU = U_2 R_2$.
4. Form $\tilde{A} = U_2^* A U_1$ and $\tilde{B} = U_2^* B U_1$.
5. Solve the projected eigenproblem $\tilde{A}\mathbf{y} = \tilde{\lambda}\tilde{B}\mathbf{y}$ of size t to obtain eigenpairs $\{(\tilde{\lambda}_i, \mathbf{y}_i)\}_{i=1}^t$. Set $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i = U_1 \mathbf{y}_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, t$.
6. Set $\Lambda = [\,]$ and $X = [\,]$.
7. For $i = 1 : t$
8. If $(\tilde{\lambda}_i, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i)$ satisfies (3.15), then $\Lambda = [\Lambda, \tilde{\lambda}_i]$ and $X = [X, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i]$.
9. End
10. If there are s eigenpairs satisfy (3.15), stop. Otherwise, set $Y = U_1$.
11. End.

Algorithm 3 faces the same issue occurred in CIRR and FEAST, that is we have to know s in advance in order to choose t for the starting matrix Y and to determine whether all desired eigenpairs are found. More precisely, the number of columns t of Y should satisfy $t \geq s$. This is because if $t < s$, then $\text{rank}(U) < s$. Consequently, the columns of U cannot form a basis for $\mathcal{K}$. Moreover, since s is unknown a priori, it is also hard to decide whether all desired eigenvalues are found and therefore it is hard to decide when to stop the algorithm. In the next section, we present strategies to address these two problems, which will make the resulting algorithm applicable to practical implementation.

4. Our Algorithm. In this section, we first introduce a method to find an upper bound for s. Our method is similar to a technique proposed in [31]. Next we design stopping criteria to guarantee all eigenvalues are captured. After that, we present the complete algorithm.

4.1. Finding an Upper Bound for the Number of Eigenvalues inside Γ. In the following, by "$M \sim \mathsf{N}_{p\times q}(0,1)$", we mean M is a $p \times q$ matrix with i.i.d. entries drawn from the standard normal distribution $\mathsf{N}(0,1)$.

In [14], an approach was proposed for finding an estimation of s. Here we derive a similar method. Let $Y \sim \mathsf{N}_{n\times p}(0,1)$. One can easily verify that the mean $\mathbb{E}[\text{trace}(Y^*MY)] = p \cdot \text{trace}(M)$ for any $n \times n$ matrix M. In particular, by (3.5) and (3.6),

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{p}\mathbb{E}[\text{trace}(Y^*U)] &= \frac{1}{p}\mathbb{E}[\text{trace}(Y^*QY)] \\ &= \text{trace}(Q) = \text{trace}(S_{(:,1:s)}(S^{-1})_{(1:s,:)}) \\ &= \text{trace}((S^{-1})_{(1:s,:)}S_{(:,1:s)}) = \text{trace}(I_s) = s. \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

So $s_0 := \frac{1}{p}\text{trace}(Y^*U)$ is a good initial estimation of s. In [14], the entries of Y are taken to be 1 or -1 with equal probability.

In Algorithm 3, we need to choose an upper bound t of s for the starting matrix $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times t}$. However, in practice, s_0 may be less than s, and we may not know this fact as we do not know s. Below we present a way to find a better estimate t based on s_0.

Recall that in CIRR, for a given integer g, we need to select an h such that $t = hg \geq s$. In [31], a method was proposed for selecting a suitable h. The method

works as follows. Assume an estimation s_0 of s is available. Let $Y \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times h}$, where $h = \lceil \frac{\kappa s_0}{g} \rceil$ and $\kappa > 1$. Compute $P_h = [F_0BY, F_1BY, \ldots, F_{g-1}BY]$ (see (2.4)) and the minimum singular value $\sigma_{\min}$ of P_h. If $\sigma_{\min}$ is not small, then h is increased until $\sigma_{\min}$ of the updated P_h is small enough. Similar to this idea, we determine an upper bound t for our Algorithm 3 by using the numerical rank of $U = QY$, where $Y \sim \mathsf{N}_{n\times t}(0,1)$. The rationale behind our method is as follows.

Let $s^\dagger$ be a positive integer and $Y_{s^\dagger} \sim \mathsf{N}_{n\times s^\dagger}(0,1)$. Consider

$$U_{s^\dagger} = QY_{s^\dagger} = S_{(:,1:s)}(S^{-1})_{(1:s,:)}Y_{s^*} = \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{-1}}\oint_\Gamma (zB-A)^{-1}BY_{s^\dagger}dz.$$

Then $U_{s^\dagger} \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times s^\star}$ is the projection of $Y_{s^\dagger}$ onto $\mathcal{K}$, and consequently, $\mathrm{rank}(U_{s^\dagger}) \le s$. With this in mind, if $\mathrm{rank}(U_{s^\dagger}) = s^\dagger$, it obviously means that $s^\dagger \le s$; and we will increase $s^\star$ and repeat the process. Otherwise, if $\mathrm{rank}(U_{s^\dagger}) < s^\dagger$, we can conclude that $s = \mathrm{rank}(U_{s^\dagger})$ with the help of Lemma 3.1; and thereby $s < s^\dagger$. Below we give the algorithm for finding t.

ALGORITHM 4. *Input an increasing factor $\alpha > 1$ and the size p of sample vectors. The function "*SEARCH*" outputs t (an upper bound of s) and the projection matrix $U_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times t}$ onto $\mathcal{K}$.*

Function $[U_1, t] = \textsc{Search}(A, B, \Gamma, \alpha, p)$

1. Pick $Y_0 \sim \mathsf{N}_{n\times p}(0,1)$ and compute $U = \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{-1}}\oint_\Gamma (zB-A)^{-1}BY_0dz$ approximately by the Gauss-Legendre quadrature rule .
2. Set $s_0 = \lceil \frac{1}{p}\mathrm{trace}(Y_0^*U) \rceil$ and $s^\dagger = \min(\max(p, s_0), n)$.
3. If $s^\dagger > p$
4. Pick $\tilde{Y} \sim \mathsf{N}_{n\times(s^\dagger - p)}(0,1)$ and compute $\tilde{U} = \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{-1}}\oint_\Gamma (zB-A)^{-1}B\hat{Y}dz$ approximately the Gauss-Legendre quadrature rule.
5. Augment V to U to form $U = [U, \tilde{U}] \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times s^\dagger}$.
6. Else
7. Set $s^\dagger = p$.
8. End
9. Compute $U = U_1R\Pi$: the rank-revealing QR decomposition [9] of U.
10. Set $t = \mathrm{rank}(R)$. If $t < s^\dagger$, stop. Otherwise, set $p = t, U = U_1$ and $s^\dagger = \lceil \alpha t \rceil$. Then go to Step 3.

In Algorithm 4, we use the rank-revealing QR decomposition method [9, 17] to detect whether U is numerically rank deficient (line 9). If this case occurs, it means that the subspace spanned by U_1 already contains $\mathcal{K}$, so we stop the procedure and get a good upper bound t. We remark that Algorithm 4 can be treated as the first iteration of Algorithm 3 because U_1 from Algorithm 4 is a projection onto $\mathcal{K}$, therefore it can be taken as the U in line 2 of Algorithm 3.

4.2. The Stopping Criteria. Although by Algorithm 4 we can obtain an upper bound t for s, the actual value of s is still unknown. Thus Algorithm 3 is still impractical because it is hard to determine whether all desired eigenpairs are captured. Below we present simple but efficient stopping criteria to guarantee this. It can also give the accuracy that the algorithm have achieved.

In Algorithm 3, there are t eigenvalues being solved in each iteration, and hence s of them are the eigenvalues we sought and $(t-s)$ of them are spurious eigenvalues.

Those spurious eigenvalues outside Γ can easily be detected by checking the values of their coordinates. It is only the spurious eigenvalues that are inside Γ that we need special attention. As the iteration progresses, the accuracy of the s desired eigenvalues will improve steadily while the accuracy of the spurious eigenvalues will not. Therefore after some iterations, there will be a gap in the accuracy between the desired eigenvalues and the spurious eigenvalues. Based on this observation, we choose a tolerance η for detecting the number of desired eigenvalues inside Γ. If after some iterations, there are s' eigenvalues inside Γ whose accuracy are smaller than η, and the value of s' is unchanged in two consecutive iterations, then we set $s = s'$. In our experiments, we set $\eta = 10^{-3}$ and we can determine s in one or two iterations.

After determining s, we will continue with the iterations so as to improve the accuracy of the s desired eigenvalues. The algorithm will stop when all s eigenvalues meet the user-prescribed tolerance ϵ, see (3.15). To avoid the situation where ϵ is set too small for the given problem, we also stop the iterations when (i) the iteration number reaches a prescribed maximum `max_iter`, or (ii) the overall accuracy of the s eigenvalues is not improved from one iteration to the next. Since we are monitoring the accuracy of the s desired eigenvalues in each iteration, we have an estimate of how accurate the s eigenvalues are when the algorithm stops.

More detailed demonstration about the idea behind the stopping criteria will be given in Section 5.

4.3. The Complete Algorithm. In this section, we present the complete algorithm which is based on Algorithm 3, Algorithm 4, and the above stopping criteria. Then we discuss some implementation issues pertaining to the algorithm.

ALGORITHM 5. *Input tolerance η for detecting the spurious eigenvalues, and the tolerance ϵ for the accuracy of the eigenpairs. The function "*GFEAST*" computes all the eigenvalues λ of (1.1) inside Γ and their associated eigenvectors $\mathbf{x}$. The computed λ and $\mathbf{x}$ are stored in vector Λ and matrix X respectively. The `flag` is set to 1 if there are s eigenpairs $(\lambda, \mathbf{x})$ satisfying (3.15), 0 if the overall accuracy is not improved from one iteration to the next; -1 if the maximum number of iterations `max_iter` is reached.*

Function $[\Lambda, X, \texttt{Err}, \texttt{flag}] = \text{GFEAST}(A, B, \Gamma, \alpha, p, \epsilon, \eta, \texttt{max_iter})$

1. Call $[U_1, t] = \text{SEARCH}(A, B, \Gamma, \alpha, p)$ to obtain an upper bound t of the exact number s of the eigenvalues inside Γ, and a projection U_1 onto $\mathcal{K}$.
2. Compute the QR decomposition: $BU_1 = U_2 R_2$.
3. Set $e(0) = 0$ and $c(0) = 0$.
4. For $k = 1, 2, \cdots, \texttt{max_iter}$
5. Form $\tilde{A} = U_2^* A U_1$ and $\tilde{B} = U_2^* B U_1$.
6. Solve the projected eigenproblem $\tilde{A}\mathbf{y} = \lambda \tilde{B}\mathbf{y}$ of size t to obtain eigenpairs $\{(\lambda_i, \mathbf{y}_i)\}_{i=1}^{t}$. Set $\mathbf{x}_i = U_1 \mathbf{y}_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, t$.
7. Set $r = [\,]$, $\Lambda^{(k)} = [\,]$, $X^{(k)} = [\,]$ and $c(k) = 0$.
8. For $i = 1 : t$
9. Compute $r_i = \|A\mathbf{x}_i - \lambda_i B\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 / (\|A\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 + \|B\mathbf{x}_i\|_2)$.
10. If λ_i inside Γ and $r_i < \eta$, then $c(k) = c(k) + 1$, $r = [r, r_i]$, $X^{(k)} = [X^{(k)}, \mathbf{x}_i]$ and $\Lambda^{(k)} = [\Lambda^{(k)}, \lambda_i]$.
11. End
12. Set $e(k) = \max(r)$.
13. If $c(k) = c(k-1)$ and $e(k) < \epsilon$, output $\Lambda = \Lambda^{(k)}$ and $X = X^{(k)}$, $\texttt{Err} = e(k), \texttt{flag} = 1$. Stop.

14. If $c(k) = c(k-1)$ and $e(k) > e(k-1)$, output $\Lambda = \Lambda^{(k-1)}$ and $X = X^{(k-1)}$, $\texttt{Err} = e(k-1), \texttt{flag} = 0$. Stop.
15. If $k = \texttt{max_iter}$, output $\Lambda = \Lambda^{(k)}$ and $X = X^{(k)}$, $\texttt{Err} = e(k), \texttt{flag} = -1$. Stop.
16. Compute $U = \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{-1}} \oint_\Gamma (zB - A)^{-1} B dz U_1$ approximately.
17. Compute QR decompositions: $U = U_1 R_1$ and $BU = U_2 R_2$.
18. End

Below we give some remarks on Algorithm 5.

1. Since the columns of the matrix U_1 obtained from the function SEARCH are orthonormalized, we only need to compute the QR decomposition for BU_1 in line 2.
2. In line 10, we keep only those eigenpairs inside Γ whose accuracy are less than η, and we consider them to be the s desired eigenpairs of (1.1) inside Γ.
3. Lines 13 to 15 are the three stopping criteria. In line 13, we stop when $e(k)$, the overall accuracy of all s desired eigenvalues, is less than ϵ. In line 14, we stop when $e(k)$ is not improved from the $(k-1)$th iteration to the kth iteration. In line 15, we stop when the maximum number of iterations is reached.

In each iteration, the dominant work is to compute the projection U. In the case when Γ is a circle with center γ and radius ρ, we can compute the contour integral in line 16 by using the q-point Gauss-Legendre quadrature on Γ. More precisely

$$U = \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{-1}} \oint_\Gamma (zB - A)^{-1} B dz U_1 \approx \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{q} \omega_j (z_j - \gamma)(z_j B - A)^{-1} B U_1, \qquad (4.2)$$

where $z_j = \gamma + \rho e^{\sqrt{-1}\theta_j}$, $\theta_j = (1+t_j)\pi$, and t_j is the jth Gaussian node with associated weight ω_j. Accordingly, it requires us to solve q generalized shifted linear systems of the form

$$(z_j B - A)\widehat{U}_j = BU_1 \quad z_j \in \mathbb{C}, \quad 1 \le j \le q. \qquad (4.3)$$

When Γ is an irregular closed curve, we can choose a circle $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ such that $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ encloses Γ. We compute all eigenpairs inside $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ and then determine the eigenpairs that are indeed inside Γ.

Like other contour-integral based methods, our algorithm replaces the difficulty of solving the eigenvalue problem (1.1) by the difficulty of solving the linear systems (4.3). One has considerable freedom to choose different approaches to solve (4.3) based on the properties of the matrices in (4.3), such as the Krylov subspace based methods [24, 34, 35]. Since (4.3) are generalized shifted systems with multiple right-hand sides, the direct methods, such as the sparse Gaussian LU factorization, are also highly recommended. Notice that once we obtain the LU factors, they can be reused when we solve (4.3) in the subsequent iterations. Moreover, since the quadrature nodes $z_j, j = 1, \ldots, q$, are independent, and the columns of the right-hand sides are also independent, our algorithm has a good potential to be parallelized.

5. Numerical Experiments. In this section, we give some numerical experiments to illustrate the efficiency of our method for computing the eigenpairs of (1.1) inside a given contour Γ. All computations are carried out in MATLAB version R2012b on a MacBook with an Intel Core i5 2.5 GHz processor and 8 GB RAM. The test matrices are from the Matrix Market collection [8]. They are the real-world problems

TABLE 5.1
Test problems from Matrix Market that are used in our experiments.

No.	Matrix	Size	nnz	Property	`condest`
1	A: BFW398A	398	3678	unsymmetric	7.58×10^3
	B: BFW398B	398	2910	symmetric indefinite	3.64×10^1
2	A: BFW782A	782	7514	unsymmetric	4.63×10^3
	B: BFW782B	782	5982	symmetric indefinite	3.05×10^1
3	A: PLAT1919	1919	17159	symmetric indefinite	1.40×10^{16}
	B: PLSK1919	1919	4831	skew symmetric	1.07×10^{18}
4	A: BCSSTK13	2003	42943	symmetric positive definite	4.57×10^{10}
	B: BCSSTM13	2003	11973	symmetric positive semi-definite	Inf
5	A: BCSSTK27	1224	28675	symmetric positive definite	7.71×10^4
	B: BCSSTM27	1224	28675	symmetric indefinite	1.14×10^{10}
6	A: MHD3200A	3200	68026	unsymmetric	2.02×10^{44}
	B: MHD3200B	3200	18316	symmetric indefinite	2.02×10^{13}
7	A: MHD4800A	4800	102252	unsymmetric	2.54×10^{57}
	B: MHD4800B	4800	27520	symmetric indefinite	1.03×10^{14}

from scientific and engineering applications. In fact, Problem 2 serves as a classic testbed for generalized non-Hermitian eigenproblem [4]. The eigenvalues of Problem 3 occur in pairs, and hence the problem is well-known as a difficult eigenproblem [8]. The matrix B of Problem 4 is singular and Problems 6 and 7 are ill-conditioned. The descriptions of these matrices are presented in TABLE 5.1, where nnz denotes the number of non-zero entries and `cond` denotes their condition numbers which are computed by MATLAB function `condest`.

In the numerical comparisons, we assume that the eigenvalues and eigenvectors computed by the MATLAB function `eig` in dense format are the accurate ones. We use Gauss-Legendre quadrature rule [11] with $q = 16$ quadrature points on Γ to compute the contour integrals (4.2). As for solving the generalized shifted linear systems of the form (4.3), we first use the MATLAB function `lu` to compute the LU decomposition of $A - z_j B, j = 1, 2, \ldots, q$, and then perform the triangular substitutions to get the corresponding solutions.

Experiment 5.1 (Finding an upper bound for s): As stressed in the introduction and in Section 3, the information about the number of eigenvalues s inside Γ is crucial to the success of contour-integral based methods—they all need an upper bound of s to start the program with. Our Algorithm 4 is devoted to finding an upper bound t. In this experiment, we test how accurate the computed t are. In the algorithm, the size p of sample vectors is set as 50, and the increasing factor α is chosen to be 1.5. TABLE 5.2 presents the results for the test problems in TABLE 5.1. In TABLE 5.2, the parameters γ and ρ denote the center and the radius of the circle Γ of each test problem respectively, s denotes the true number of eigenvalues inside Γ as obtained from MATLAB (by computing all eigenvalues and selecting those inside Γ), s_0 is the initial estimate obtained by the trace formula (see (4.1) or line 2 in Algorithm 4), and t is the upper bound that our Algorithm 4 gives.

From TABLE 5.2, we see that for the first five well-conditioned problems, the estimates s_0 are good approximations of s though it can underestimate s as in Problem 1. However for the ill-conditioned Problems 6 and 7, s_0 are not good—it underestimates and overestimates s by large margins. However our Algorithm 4 gives quite reasonable upper bounds t in all seven problems.

Experiment 5.2 (Separation of true and spurious eigenvalues): Once we get an upper bound t of the number of eigenvalues inside Γ, we can separate the $(t-s)$ spurious

TABLE 5.2

Results of Algorithm 4: s is the exact number of eigenvalues inside Γ as computed by MATLAB, *s_0 is the estimate of s by using the trace formula (4.1) and t is the upper bound computed by our Algorithm 4.*

No.	γ	ρ	s	s_0	t
1	-5.0×10^5	2.0×10^5	123	122	137
2	-6.0×10^5	3.0×10^5	230	231	262
3	0	1.0×10^{-3}	270	277	328
4	0	6.0×10^5	172	173	183
5	5.0×10^3	2.0×10^3	107	107	118
6	-4.0×10^1	3.0×10^1	162	118	178
7	-6.0	3.0	169	3667	186

TABLE 5.3

Number of iterations required to get the correct s for different η's.

η	No.1	No.2	No.3	No.4	No.5	No.6	No.7
10^{-3}	1	2	1	2	2	2	2
10^{-5}	2	2	2	2	3	3	3
10^{-7}	2	3	3	3	3	4	3
10^{-9}	3	3	–	–	4	–	–

eigenvalues from the s desired ones by using a threshold η as explained in Section 4.2. In fact, the accuracy of the true eigenvalues will continue to improve as the iteration progresses while those of the spurious eigenvalues will not. Therefore the number of eigenvalues with accuracy better than η will improve monotonically with each iteration, but once the number becomes constant in two consecutive iterations, we treat that number as our computed s. The accuracy of each eigenpair $(\lambda_i, \mathbf{x}_i)$ is measured by

$$r_i = \frac{\|A\mathbf{x}_i - \lambda_i B\mathbf{x}_i\|_2}{\|A\mathbf{x}_i\|_2 + \|B\mathbf{x}_i\|_2}, \quad 1 \le i \le t. \tag{5.1}$$

TABLE 5.3 gives the number of iterations required to get our computed s with the given η's. We remark that our computed s are exactly the same as the true s computed by MATLAB so we do not write them out again in TABLE 5.3. We see that if η is set too small (e.g. 10^{-9}), not all desired eigenvalues can attain such accuracy and we may not be able to get the true s. However, for $\eta = 10^{-3}$, we need only one or two iterations to get the true s. Hence in the following experiments, we set $\eta = 10^{-3}$.

Experiment 5.3 (Stopping criteria): Here we illustrate the convergence behavior of our algorithm and explain the stopping criteria we used. In FIG. 5.1, we plot the maximum error of the s desired eigenvalues $\texttt{Err} := \max_{1 \le i \le s} r_i$ for all seven problems, starting from the iterations where s is first determined until the 10th iteration (the iteration numbers where s is first determined are given in the first row of TABLE 5.3). We see from FIG. 5.1 that `Err` decreases monotonically and dramatically in the first few iterations for all test problems. Then it maintains at almost the same level for the first five problems while it rebounds for the ill-conditioned problems Nos. 6 and 7.

Thus the stopping criteria in our algorithm are

(i) when `Err` in the current iteration is less than a given tolerance ϵ (line 13 in Algorithm 5),

(ii) when `Err` starts to increase again from one iteration to the next (line 14 in Algorithm 5), or



FIG. 5.1. *The maxmum relative residual norms in different iterations.*

TABLE 5.4
Comparison of `eig` *and our method.*

No.	Size	`eig`			our method		
		`Err`	#eig	Time (sec.)	`Err`	#eig	Time (sec.)
1	398	6.75×10^{-14}	123	0.67	6.02×10^{-15}	123	1.21
2	782	3.83×10^{-14}	230	10.22	8.70×10^{-15}	230	6.16
3	1919	4.77×10^{-9}	270	116.12	1.07×10^{-9}	270	31.24
4	2003	2.52×10^{-6}	172	269.56	1.21×10^{-8}	172	29.10
5	1224	1.25×10^{-11}	107	48.83	4.86×10^{-13}	107	8.39
6	3200	5.76×10^{-7}	162	561.29	5.22×10^{-9}	162	24.90
7	4800	1.44×10^{-7}	169	2725.43	5.10×10^{-8}	169	101.91

(iii) when the maximum number of iterations (line 15 in Algorithm 5) is reached. For example, if we set $\epsilon = 10^{-10}$, the algorithm will stop in the sixth iteration for both Problems 6 and 7, and return the eigenpairs it found in the 5th iteration.

Experiment 5.4 (Comparisons with other methods): Here we compare our method with two other methods both in terms of accuracy and timing.

We first compare our method with MATLAB function `eig`. We set $\epsilon = 10^{-16}$ and `max_iter` $= 10$ for our method. The goal is to examine the accuracy that our method can achieve. For all test problems, our method stops in Line 14 before reaching `max_iter`. The comparison of these two solvers are listed in TABLE 5.4. It is clear that our algorithm can achieve higher accuracy when compared with `eig` and can find all eigenvalues inside the target regions. In terms of CPU time, except for Problem 1 where the size is small, our algorithm runs significantly faster—though we should stress that `eig` has to compute all eigenvalues while our method computes only those inside Γ.

Finally we compare our method with the block version of the CIRR method (BLOCK_CIRR), i.e., Algorithm 1. For the sake of fairness, in the test we apply the recently developed iterative refinement approach [31] to BLOCK_CIRR. We set

TABLE 5.5
Comparison of BLOCK_CIRR *and our method.*

No.	s	BLOCK_CIRR			our method		
		`Err`	#eig	Time (sec.)	`Err`	#eig	Time (sec.)
1	123	1.41×10^{-9}	123	0.68	9.16×10^{-14}	123	0.72
2	230	9.47×10^{-9}	230	5.14	1.70×10^{-11}	230	3.23
3	270	2.14×10^{-9}	270	3.66	6.45×10^{-9}	270	17.58
4	172	2.22×10^{-2}	172	21.13	1.21×10^{-8}	172	29.10
5	107	2.32×10^{-12}	107	1.23	6.03×10^{-13}	107	4.21
6	162	7.23×10^{-1}	121	4.84	7.74×10^{-9}	162	21.10
7	169	1.99×10^{-1}	120	98.26	5.10×10^{-8}	169	101.91

$\epsilon = 10^{-8}$ and `max_iter` $= 10$ for both our method and BLOCK_CIRR. The numerical results are reported in TABLE 5.5. We see that the BLOCK_CIRR algorithm fails for Problems 4, 6 and 7 where we recall that the matrix B of Problem 4 is singular, and Problems 6 and 7 are ill-conditioned. Therefore, we see that our algorithm is more accurate and stable when compared to the BLOCK_CIRR.

However, BLOCK_CIRR outperforms our method in terms of timing. The dominant computational cost in each iteration of both methods are the solution of $q = 16$ linear systems of the form in (4.3). But the number of right-hand sides in the BLOCK_CIRR is always set to be a small number (16 in the tests here), while in our method, it is t ($\geq s$). Consequently, the block-CIRR method always requires less CPU time than our method. It is our future project to extend our method to block form so as to minimize the number of right hand sides.

6. Conclusions. We develop a contour-integral based method which extends the FEAST algorithm to non-Hermitian problems. It can compute the eigenvalues lying inside a given region in the complex plane and their associated eigenvectors. To extract the desired eigenpairs, we use the oblique projection technique with appropriately chosen test subspace rather than the Rayleigh-Ritz procedure. The numerical experiments illustrate that our algorithm is fast and can achieve high accuracy. We also provide a way to find an upper bound of the number of eigenvalues inside the contour, and give stopping criteria to guarantee that all eigenvalues are captured when the method stops. Our algorithm is easily parallelizable. How to further improve its numerical performance, and to extend it to nonlinear eigenproblems will be our future work.

7. Acknowledgment. We would like to thank Dr. Peter P. T. Tang who introduced the FEAST algorithm to us. We would also like to thank Professor Tetsuya Sakurai for many fruitful discussions and providing us the codes of the BLOCK_CIRR method.

REFERENCES

[1] L. AHLFORS, *Complex Analysis*, 3rd Edition, McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1979.
[2] A. ANDERSON, Z. BAI, C. BISCHOF, S. BLACKFORD, J. DEMMEL, J. DONGARRA, J. DU CROZ, A GREENBAUM, S. HAMMARLING, A. MCKENNEY, AND D. SORENSEN, *LAPACK Users' Guide*, 3rd Edition, SIAM, Philadephia, 1999.
[3] A. P. AUSTIN AND L. N. TREFETHEN, *Computing eigenvalues of real real symmetric matrices with rational filters in real arithmetic*, preprint.
[4] Z. BAI, J. DEMMEL, J. DONGARRA, A. RUHE, AND H. VAN DER VORST, *Templates for the Solution of Algebraic Eigenvalue Problems: A Practical Guide* , SIAM, Philadelphia, 2000.

[5] Z. Bai, J. Demmel, and M. Gu, *An inverse free parallel spectral divide and conquer algorithm for nonsymmetric eigenproblem*, Numer. Math., 76 (1997), pp. 279–308.
[6] B. Beckermann, G. H. Golub, and G. Labahn, *On the numerical condition of a generalized Hankel eigenvalue problem*, Numer. Math., 106 (2007), pp. 41–68.
[7] J. Berns-Müller and A. Spence, *Inexact inverse iteration with variable shift for nonsymmetric generalized eigenvalue problems*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl., 28 (2006), pp. 1069–1082.
[8] R. F. Boisvert, R. Pozo, K. Remington, R. Barrett, and J. Dongarra, *The matrix market: A web repository for test matrix data*, in The Quality of Numerical Software, Assessment and Enhancement, R. Boisvert, ed., Chapman & Hall, London, 1997, pp. 125 –137.
[9] T. T. Chan, *Rank revealing QR factorizations*, Lin. Alg. Appl., 88-89 (1987), pp. 67–82.
[10] D. Chu, L-Z. Liao, and M. K. Ng, *Sparse orthogonal linear discriminant Analysis* SIAM, J. Sci. Comput., 34 (2012), pp. A2421–A2443.
[11] P. J. Davis and P. Rabinowitz, *Methods of numerical integration*, 2nd Edition, Academic Press, Orlando, FL, 1984.
[12] J. Demmel, *Applied Numerical Linear Algebra*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 1997.
[13] B. Ford and G. Hall, *The generalized eigenvalue problem in quantum chemistry*, Comput. Phys. Commun., 8 (1974), pp. 337–348.
[14] Y. Futamura, H. Tadano, and T. Sakurai, *Parallel stochastic estimation method of eigenvalue distribution*, JSIAM Letters 2 (2010), pp.127–130.
[15] K. Gallivan, E. Grimme, and P. Van Dooren, *A rational Lanczos algorithm for model reduction*, Numer. Algorithms, 12 (1996), pp. 33–64.
[16] F. R. Gantmacher, *The Theory of Matrices*, Chelsea, New York, 1959.
[17] G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan, *Matrix Computations*, 3rd Edition, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, 1996.
[18] R. G. Grimes, J. D. Lewis, and H. D. Simon, *A shifted block Lanczos algorithm for solving sparse symmetric generalized eigenproblems*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl., 15 (1994), pp. 228–272.
[19] A. Imakura, L. Du, and T. Sakurai, *A block Arnoldi-type contour integral spectral projection method for solving generalized eigenvalue problems*, Appl. Math. Lett., 32 (2014), pp. 22–27.
[20] T. Ikegami and T. Sakurai, *Contour integral eigensolver for non-Hermitian systems: a Rayleigh-Ritz-type approach*, Taiwanese J. Math., 14 (2010), pp. 825–837.
[21] T. Ikegami, T. Sakurai, and U. Nagashima, *A filter diagonalization for generalized eigenvalue problems based on the Sakurai-Sugiura projection method*, J. Comp. Appl. Math., 233 (2010), pp. 1927–1936.
[22] W. D. Joubert, *Lanczos methods for the solution of nonsymmetric systems of linear equations*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl., 13 (1992), pp. 926–943.
[23] L. Krämer, E. Di Napoli, M. Galgon, B. Lang, and P. Bientinesi, *Dissecting the FEAST algorithm for generalized eigenproblems*, J. Comput. Appl. Math., 244 (2013), pp. 1–9.
[24] K. Meerbergen and Z. Bai, *The Lanczos method for parameterized symmetric linear systems with multiple right-hand sides*, SIAM, J. Matrix Anal. Appl., 31 (2010), pp. 1642–1662.
[25] C. B. Moler and G. W. Stewart, *An algorithm for generalized matrix eigenvalue problems*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal., 10 (1973), pp. 241–256.
[26] Y. Nakatsukasa and N. J. Higham, *Stable and efficient spectral divide and conquer algorithms for the symmetric eigenvalue decomposition and the SVD*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 35 (2013), pp. A1325–A1349.
[27] E. Polizzi, *Density-matrix-based algorithm for solving eigenvalue problems*, Phys. Rev. B 79 (2009) 115112.
[28] A. Ruhe, *Rational Krylov: A practical algorithm for large sparse nonsymmetric matrix pencils*, SIAM J. Sci. Comput., 19 (1998), pp. 1535–1551.
[29] Y. Saad, *Numerical Methods for Large Eigenvalue Problems*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 2011.
[30] Y. Saad, J. R. Chelikowsky, and S. M. Shontz, *Numerical methods for electronic structure calculations of materials*, SIAM Review, 52 (2010), pp. 3–54.
[31] T. Sakurai, Y. Futamura, and H. Tadano, *Efficient parameter estimation and implementation of a contour integral-based eigensolver*, J. Alg. Comput. Tech., 7 (2013), pp. 249–269.
[32] T. Sakurai and H. Sugiura, *A projection method for generalized eigenvalue problems using numerical integration*, J. comput. Appl. Math., 159 (2003), pp. 119–128.
[33] T. Sakurai and H. Tadano, *CIRR: A Rayleigh–Ritz type method with contour integral for generalized eigenvalue problems*, Hokkaido Math. J. 36 (2007), pp. 745–757.
[34] V. Simoncini and D. B. Szyld, *Recent computational developments in Krylov subspace methods for linear systems*, Numer. Linear Algebra Appl., 14 (2007), pp. 1–59.

[35] T. Sogabe, T. Hoshi, S. -L. Zhang, and T. Fujiwara, *Solution of generalized shifted linear systems with complex symmetric matrices*, J. Comput. Phys., 231 (2012), pp. 5669–5684.
[36] B. K. Sriperumbudur, D. A. Torres, and G. R. G. Lanckriet, *A majorization-minimization approach to the sparse generalized eigenvalue problem*, Mach. Learn., 85 (2011), pp. 3–39.
[37] G. W. Stewart, *Matrix Algorithms, Vol. II, Eigensystems*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 2001.
[38] P. T. P. Tang and E. Polizzi, *FEAST as a subspace iteration eigensolver accelerated by approximate spectral projection*, SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl., 35 (2014), pp. 354–390.
[39] E. Virnik, *Stability analysis of positive descriptor systems*, Linear Algebra Appl., 429 (2008), pp. 2640–2659.